

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 10-12, 15, 16, 20-22 and 25-27 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 10, 11, 20, 21 and 27 are amended. Support for this amendment can be found at least in the specification, for example, in Fig. 2 and in the corresponding passages of the specification.

The courtesies extended to Applicant's representative by Examiner Pappas at the interview held November 15, 2005, are appreciated. Applicant's separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

I. Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

The June 13, 2005 Office Action rejects claims 1-6, 10-16 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over "Computer Graphics: Principles and Practice" to Foley et al. in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. US 2003/0011618A1 to Deering, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,990,904 to Griffin. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1-6, 10-16 and 19 would not have been rendered obvious by Foley in view of Deering, and further in view of Griffin. None of the applied references teach or suggest "the depth cueing area being set unrelated to a size and a shape of the object," as recited in claim 1, and as similarly recited in independent claims 10, 11, 20, 21 and 27. Nowhere does Foley teach or suggest the claimed depth cueing area. Foley only discloses the use of bounding boxes for identifying overlapped objects.

Further, Deering and Griffin do not remedy the deficiencies of Foley. Deering is only cited by the Office Action for its alleged teaching of varying an alpha value. Griffin is only cited by the Office Action for its alleged teaching of sorting objects of which alpha values are varied.

Thus, claims 1, 10, 11, 20, 21 and 27 are patentable over Foley, Deering, and Griffin. Further, claims 2, 5, 6, 12, 15, 16, 22, 25 and 26, which depend variously from claims 1, 11,

and 21, are also patentable over Foley, Deering and Griffin for these reasons discussed with respect to the independent claims, as well as the additional features recited therein.

Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 10-12, 15, 16, 20-22 and 25-27 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Randi B. Isaacs
Registration No. 56,046

JAO:RBI/brp

Date: November 30, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--